

REMARKS

Summary Of The Office Action

Claims 1-5 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 3 have been objected to for reciting that the node connection starts from the lowest priority, which the Examiner states contradicts the illustration of Figures 2, 3D and 3E. Applicant submits that amended claims 1 and 3 are not objectionable.

The Examiner requires that Figure 1 be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art--. Submitted herewith is a Submission of Drawings which labels Fig. 1 "Prior Art".

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the combination of "IEEE Standard for a High Performance Serial Bus", Gorin et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,020,059) and Douceur et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,061). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Analysis of the Rejection of Claims 1-5

The reasons for the rejection of claims 1-5 are set forth in Section No. 5 of the Office Action beginning at page 3. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's analysis.

For example, the Examiner states that the Douceur teaches bandwidth reservation is known to guarantee resource, and that since the isochronous transmission is part of the 1394 features, the bandwidth reservation is a must practice, and, therefore, the nodes at the top of the 1394 tree will need higher bandwidth to support the isochronous transmission. Applicant submits, however, that bandwidth reservation, by itself or in combination with the teachings of

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APP. 09/485,443

the other applied references, does not teach or suggest the claimed feature of connecting a non-used port of the node of the highest priority with the port of node of the next priority.

That is, the teaching of the IEEE Standard regarding grouping the nodes with the same speed capacity adjacent to one another and producing the number of hops, combined with the teaching of Gorin as minimizing the tree depth for reducing the hops between the root and leaves, and the teaching of Douceur of reserving bandwidth, does not render obvious the combination recited in claim 1, including having nodes of higher speed assigned a higher priority and connecting a non-used port of the node of the highest priority with the port of the node of the next priority. Douceur's teaching with respect to bandwidth reservation does not suggest, even in combination with the teaching of the other references, that nodes of higher speed have higher priority.

Similar arguments apply to claim 3.

Additionally, Applicant submits that the dependent claims are patentable at least for the same reasons the independent claims are patentable.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APP. 09/485,443

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER



Peter A. McKenna
Registration No. 38,551

Date: November 12, 2003